



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(We're) . . . single men in barricks, most remarkable like you;
 An' if sometimes our conduct isn't all your fancy paints,
 Why, single men in barricks don't grow into plaster saints.

Now when Ariosto wrote his *Satira VI, ad Annibale Malaguzzo, sul Matrimonio* (1525) he merely said

Non pote uom in bontade esser perfetto

and this, in the not widely known English translation of the Satires, brought out by Temple Henry Croker (1759), becomes Kipling's parallel in

Whatever legends feign or preachers paint,
 A single man's bad stuff to make a saint. (ll. 19-20)

The unidentified Mr. H——n to whom the vagrant and mercurial Irish editor assigns the translation of this particular Satire seems interested in real rather than plaster appearance of holiness, it is true, but even so, the verbal kinship of the passages is interesting without being of great importance.

Columbia University.

GILBERT W. MEAD.

BRIEF MENTION

The Measures of the Poets: A New System of English Prosody. By M. A. Bayfield (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1919). "Sidney Lanier [in his book "published some forty years ago," which "unfortunately I did not hear of until the present work was written"] advocated the trochaic base for our lyrics, but strangely enough retained the iambic base for blank verse. English books on the subject still continue to adopt the iambic base, even for lyrics, and accordingly the system put forth in these pages is, so far as the systems in vogue are concerned, altogether revolutionary" . . . "For while the system generally received and taught, which is founded on the traditional iambic base, can readily be shown to rest on radical misconceptions of the whole matter and to break down at every turn when tested by the work of the poets, with the adoption of the trochaic base, as here proposed, every feature and variation of the verse is seen to have arisen naturally and easily, and nothing is left unexplained." In these statements, in the form of a preface, the author's purpose in publishing this book (kept within the limits of 112 pages) is clearly announced. Mr. Bayfield's experience in the use of words warrants the reader now to expect the employment of an accurate, scientific method both in defining the "misconceptions of the whole matter" to which the traditional acceptance of the 'iambic base' is declared to be due, and in demonstrating the validity of the assumption that the trochee is the basic foot in English versification. The expectant reader of Mr. Bayfield's 'revolutionary' discussion will, however, experience no slight degree of disappointment.

By direct assertion Mr. Bayfield communicates the hypothesis for his *a priori* argument from the practice of the poets. Thus, "The normal foot of our verse, $\acute{\text{v}}$, is called a *trochee*; it is to be noted that the stressed syllable comes first. The combination $\text{v} \acute{\text{v}}$, which cannot form a metrical foot, because the stressed syllable does not come first, is called an *iambus*" (p. 2). "*Trochee* . . . , the staple foot of the bulk of English verse. . . . *Iambus*, $\text{v} \acute{\text{v}}$. This is not used as a metrical foot in English" (p. 5). It is, however, acknowledged that this fundamental assumption has been suggested by the notation of music: "When music was first marked off in bars (in the 16th century), the principle instinctively adopted was to begin each bar with a stressed note; and this would seem to be the natural mode of division, although many musical themes begin with a note that is not accented. Considering the close analogy between music and verse, to mark off the units of a verse measure otherwise would therefore seem to be as *un-natural* as it would be to divide the notes of a waltz into bars each of which began with the third beat" (p. 34).

One might let the whole matter rest with what has been cited from Mr. Bayfield's paragraphs. These citations disclose an attitude of mind that does not lead one to expect anything new or 'revolutionary' that is also convincing. But Mr. Bayfield's strong emphasis on the newness of his point of view is not sufficiently modified by his references to Schmidt's theory of the antique rhythms or to the treatise by Lanier. At all events one is not prepared for the absence of a consideration of the tradition to which Mr. Saintsbury gives attention in his excursus "on the point whether the iamb or the trochee is really the staple foot of English poetry," promised in his *Hist. of Engl. Prosody*, II (1908), p. viii, and then published in the third volume of that work (Appendix II). In this connection one recalls Aristotle's interest in the question concerning the basic foot of Greek: "The heroic rhythm is too dignified [for prose], and is deficient in conversational harmony. The iambic rhythm, on the other hand, is the very diction of ordinary life, and is therefore of all metres the most frequent in conversation; but it is deficient in dignity and impressiveness. The trochaic rhythm approximates too much to broad comedy, as appears in trochaic tetrameters; for the tetrameter is a tripping rhythm" (*Rhet.*, III, chap. viii; Welldon's translation). Dionysius of Halicarnassus (chap. xvii) also recognized the difference in movement between iambic and trochaic rhythms. In his judgment, the iambic rhythm is 'not ignoble'; the trochaic rhythm is 'less manly, more ignoble.'

Mr. Bayfield is not concerned with the fundamental inquiry as to the 'natural' predominance of a certain rhythm in English. He does not ask the question whether the language runs *most* acceptably in this or that rhythm, a question that is answered by

the character of the language and the long tradition of its acceptable versification. Disregarding the linguistic argument and denying the evidence of national tradition, he simply adopts a late device in musical notation, and Hartmann's new term *anacrusis* as the key that releases all secrets, and declares that he has thereby arrived at the "trochaic scheme" as the "strictly indispensable requisite for any prosodic scheme—*continuity of rhythm*." The implication that iambic meters are subversive of continuity of rhythm is, to say the least, startling. Because of the fascination of prosodic theories, some will be persuaded by Mr. Bayfield's contention,—no heresy has yet failed to win adherents. He is already numbering some four unnamed—they will probably remain unnamed—poets. But he will not lay under a spell the well-grounded inquirer into the principles of versification, who is always prepared to be charmed by an additional ray of light upon truth. Noteworthy is the reaction of Mr. Saintsbury, in *The Athenaeum* for Nov. 7 (see also Mr. Bayfield's letter, in the same periodical for Nov. 21, and Mr. Saintsbury's final utterance, the expression of an almost impatient and certainly uncompromising finality, a week later).

When a verse is said to be, for example, an iambic pentameter, it is meant that the rhythm, as determined by the meter, is iambic. However, it has come to be usual to use the terms rhythm and meter interchangeably to designate the movement of a verse. Aristotle is exact in defining meter as the marking off of the sections of rhythm. But Mr. Bayfield insists on a difference between rhythm and meter that disunites them in a way that contradicts the fundamental principle of rhythm. There is no law of rhythm that requires the wave of movement to begin only or even most frequently at a crest. In the notation of music the bar does not signify that music is prevailingly trochaic-anapestic in movement. Mr. Bayfield commits the error of assuming that a merely graphic, external device in one art conditions in another art an inner and vital law, and extenuates his error by denying the relation between rhythm and meter.

There has been good ground for believing that no editor of Chaucer (after Skeat's gradual conversion) or of Shakespeare would now hesitate in accepting two important features of iambic measures, namely, the occasional use of the 'direct attack' ($\angle | \times \angle$) and of the trochaic beginning ($\angle \times \angle$). But Mr. Bayfield, with surprising indifference to an achieved result, attempts to overturn the whole tradition of English versification by assuming, on the evidence of these occasional beginnings, that all so-called iambic lines are trochaic in meter, tho usually mixed in rhythm. The 'direct attack' in blank verse produces, in his judgment, pure trochaic lines. He counts 66 occurrences in Marlowe's seven plays and "in all Shakespeare's 176." That many of these lines have a vocative or exclamatory beginning is not considered:

Hear you, master steward, where's our master?
 Come, good fellow, put mine iron on.
 O this learning, what a thing it is!
 Grace go with you, Benedicite!
 Out, you rogue, you pluck my foot awry.

Normally, it is admitted, the line (in blank verse) has an upbeat, which is, however, structurally hypermetric, an anacrusis. But this upbeat is omitted at the convenience of the poet; sometimes for an emphasis on the first word, tho "often there is no emphasis at all there." The trochaic beginning (here scanned $\angle \times \times | \angle$) is the result:

Shook, but delayed to strike though oft invoked
 Roaring, and all the wave was in a flame
 Swifter than dreams the white flown feet of sleep

The trochaic beginning (properly scanned $\angle \times | \times \angle$) has a fixed place in the long tradition of the iambic line, but the secondary accents and the accents of connective and relational words reduce the usually assumed number of occurrences. Of all this Mr. Bayfield says nothing. For him, "when the upbeat is wanting, in our measure, the first foot is almost always resolved" ($\angle \times \times$).

For the most part Mr. Bayfield scans according to his conception of the prose-emphasis of the line, but even in this matter sense must often be sacrificed to the trochaic hypothesis. The liberties taken with rhythm in upholding the theory are also augmented in a peculiar adoption of 'resolution' and of a foot of one syllable. Thus, by 'resolving' the second foot the 'traditional' iambic pentameter becomes identical with the *Phalæcean* meter; and it becomes identical with a Sapphic line when the resolution is in the third foot:

Hé that | párts us shall | bríng a | bránd from | heaven
 Whát may | yóu be? | Áre you of | góod or | évil

Warning is given that "a resolution may easily escape notice," as in

O : this is the | *poison* of | déep | gríef; it | springs

Here, however, the true resolution is in the thesis of the second iamb (*is the poi-*), there is, of course, no anacrusis, and the monosyllabic foot is inadmissible. Strangely, Mr. Bayfield has not inferred from the notation of music that an arsis or a thesis may be broken into two parts together equivalent to the required rhythmic note.

The monosyllabic foot is defined as either "a stressed syllable protracted to the time-value of a whole foot, usually for emphasis, but not always," or, "a stressed syllable followed by a pause."

It is "usually followed or preceded by a resolved foot in order to ease the rhythm, but in Shakespeare a monosyllabic 4th foot is quite common." A few illustrative lines render comment redundant:

Are of | *two* | houses: | lawful | mercy
 The ∶ very | *stones* | prate of my | wherea | bouts
 Not ∶ cast a | side so | soon.—Was the | *hope* | drunk
 Where ∶ in you | dress'd your | self? hath it | *slept* | since?

Holding that rhythm and scansion (meter) do not necessarily coincide, or rather that rhythm, which in Mr. Bayfield's mind is emphasis, would be falsified by straightforward scansion (p. 28), he gains the right to admit an iambic movement in a trochaic measure, and especially to unite the two movements within the limits of a line. His disapproval of "an unbroken iambic or an unbroken trochaic rhythm all through" a line (p. 26) has led him to adopt the monosyllabic foot with its usually supporting resolution. The disclosure of method in his dealing with it will surely excuse the citation of a line that has become hackneyed in prosodic discussion:

To ∶ be, or | not to | be, \wedge || that is the | question

"The *rhythm* of the first six words," he declares, "as distinct from their scansion, is iambic, but this disappears after the monosyllabic foot, and we have the rhythm $\acute{\circ} \circ \circ | \angle \circ ||$."

In this admission of a change from one rhythm to another within the same line, Mr. Bayfield's subjectivity mounts to its most preposterous pitch. For the present, one may be content to add nothing to Mr. Saintsbury's comment.

If it may be granted that a sufficiently clear view of the dominant doctrine set forth in this treatise has now been given, the purpose of this notice has been accomplished. The author's evaluation of various kinds of metrical units and his scansion of lyric measures would remain to be discussed, if his primary assumptions could be regarded as being somewhat less than fundamentally untenable. Presumably Mr. Bayfield has "A mind not to be changed by time or place" and will before long publish, as announced, *A Study of Shakespeare's Versification*. That may provide an occasion to make amends for the incompleteness of the present comments.

J. W. B.

Professor Percy H. Boynton's *American Poetry* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918) is a gratifying addition to the still somewhat scanty list of American anthologies. It is a generous collection of nearly six hundred double-column pages of verse, selected with two main purposes: to represent the progress of

American poetry and American thought, and to indicate the chief characteristics of the various authors. To further the first of these purposes the editor has included, along with selections from the twenty-five poets who are specially represented, four time-groups of fugitive poems of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and lyrics of the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. For the same purpose the order of chronology is so far neglected as to bring together the verse of Whittier, Lowell, the Civil War lyricists, Timrod, and Hayne, and to place Longfellow and Holmes after these poets.

The second purpose requires the inclusion of a sufficient number of the poems of each author to make clear the variety of his work and the development of his art. Unfortunately such a method of selection does not always best represent the literature as a whole or best meet the needs of those teachers to whom the study of American literature is not merely or primarily the study of American men of letters. It is a method which seems to require, for instance, that poems too long to be printed entire must be represented by extracts. And the making of such extracts is always a thankless task. In the case of *Hiawatha* it is not impossible to choose satisfactory excerpts; but *Evangeline* and *The Courtship of Miles Standish* suffer so greatly by abridgement that they had better be omitted altogether. Whittier's *Snow-Bound* is particularly disappointing in this volume. The omission of lines 175-211 does not, to be sure, retard the story; but the story is written around those lines. The student who fails to read them misses the fact that the poem is Whittier's *In Memoriam*. The same criticism applies to *Sir Launfal*. By general consent the parable is the least valuable part of that uneven poem, and the nature-poetry through which Lowell finds his way to the theme is the most valuable. Why, then, for the sake of the story omit the poetry? Or why not omit altogether a poem that could so easily be spared to make room for others? For there are always other poets who deserve admission to an anthology. One misses Taylor and Aldrich of the Metropolitan group, for example, and regrets the absence of Emily Dickinson and such blithe spirits as Bunner and Eugene Field.

The critical comments, which are the work of several editors, are on the whole just and helpful. That is all the more reason why slips like *The Baltimore Saturday Victor* (p. 638) for *The Baltimore Saturday Visiter* and "The present writer cannot but help thinking" should not appear in them. In the text of the poems and in the Index of Subjects there are misprints and typographical errors—such, for example, as p. 133, l. 237, bill for fill; p. 235, l. 351, Those for Whose; p. 234, l. 28 Lenore! for Lenore? l. 57, further for farther; and the incorrect indexing of Timrod's *Ethnogenesis* and *The Cotton Boll*, p. 704, and Lowell's *Columbus*, p. 705. These make an early revision of this useful and timely work desirable.

J. C. F.

Astronomical Lore in Chaucer. By Florence M. Grimm (University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature and Criticism, No. 2, Lincoln, 1919). This interesting little monograph makes a bold attempt to deal with the complicated subject of Chaucer's working knowledge of what he presents in theory in the *Astrolabe*. From its first chapter and from its treatment of such topics as the Harmony of the Spheres one might guess that it was written as a convenient manual for the beginner in the Chaucerian field. Much of the material is a résumé of scholarly opinion (for which closer references might well have been given) or an interpretative collection of Chaucer's own allusions. From this point of view, although it might be wise to exclude a reference to theories such as that of the identification of "Louis" (p. 28) with the son of Clifford (see *Mod. Philol.* xiv, pp. 513 ff.), it would have been better to devote the introduction to a review of the knowledge of the subject which is revealed by Chaucer's immediate predecessors or contemporaries. How much, for instance, was available in the discussions of the Seven Liberal Arts, or in the work of Bartholomew Anglicus (known to many and translated by Trevisa)? How well did Chaucer's information compare with that of Lydgate? One statement is made: "Throughout the long dark centuries of the Middle Ages it survived in the studies of the retired students of the monasteries and of the few exceptionally enlightened men who still had some regard for pagan learning" (p. 6). But one suspects that this view needs correction, both in regard to the darkness of the centuries and the numbers of the enlightened men.

There are some unfortunate deficiencies in the material dealt with. The discussion of the *Almagest* (p. 10, n. 1) might have been helped by consulting Miss Hammond's bibliography. One hardly cites Rambeau (p. 12) without reservations. The confusion of planets and deities is common in allegory of the period (see p. 69, n. 3). The discussion of Venus (pp. 45 ff.) might have included matters touched on by Professor Tupper (*N. Y. Nation*, xcvii, 354 ff.). It might have been difficult to do more with the *Complaint of Mars* as an astronomical *tour de force*, or with the "north-north-west" of the *Parlement*, but some reference to these problems might have been made with advantage. The analysis of the fatalism in Chaucer's characters is only as unsatisfactory as its brevity might lead one to expect; possible change or growth in Chaucer's views is not hinted at. As a contribution, therefore, the study is not all that might be desired, but it breaks the ground for a broader survey and it brings together many of the important points which must be considered. Typographical errors appear at the bottom of page 8, and the last two lines of note 3, p. 32.

H. R. P.